



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,290	12/20/2000	Adam L. Berger	12481-002001	6981

7590

07/30/2004

Nokia, Inc.

Attn: Ian L. Cartier

313 Fairchild Drive

Mountain View, CA 94043

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,290

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08202001, 03212002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 12/20/2000.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 26, 27 and 28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams et al. (hereafter referred to as Adams), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Adams discloses altering portions of a text of an original version of a digital document to produce a revised version of the digital document in which the text is shorter than the text of the original document, the altering being done based on preferences associated with a device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. In these sections Adams shows that text elements may be reformatted or split into multiple text elements and the elements may be removed based on priority values attached to the elements. In col. 3 lines 56-59 Adams specifically discusses subdividing text elements for display on a pervasive computing device. The retrieved content modification file determines how the web page content is modified for a particular device. Altering the content modification file can customize the transformation for different devices. Adams discloses receiving over a communication channel a

Art Unit: 2176

request for the digital document from the device and transmitting the revised version over the communication channel in response to the request in fig. 1A and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Adams discloses applying more than one transformation selectively to the text in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The retrieved content modification file selectively invokes transformations upon the web page content so that the transmitted file is properly displayed on the destination device in accordance with the preferences of the device.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Adams discloses applying transformations to the text based on preferences associated with the device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The retrieved content modification file selectively invokes transformations upon the web page content so that the transmitted file is properly displayed on the destination device in accordance with the preferences of the device.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Adams discloses that the preferences are associated with the device based on a unique identifier of the device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The content modification file contains transformation information unique to the requesting device and is retrieved based a unique identifier of the requesting device.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored in advance of the request for a document in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The preferences are stored in advance in the content modification file.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored in a database associated with a server in col. 6 lines 3-19.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 7, Adams discloses that the preferences are indicated by a user through an interface of the device in col. 4 lines 7-10.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Adams discloses that the preferences of the user are stored in a content modification file located in a database associated with the server and the user preferences are selected via an interface other than the device from which the request for the digital document is made in col. 4 lines 7-10 and col. 6 line 3-19.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Adams discloses that the content modification file is stored in a database associated with a server and the content modification file may be accessed and modified with a form in col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored for each device from which requests for documents may be received in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. There is a corresponding content modification file available for retrieval for each device.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored for each device from which requests for documents may be received in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. There is a corresponding content modification file available for retrieval for each device.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Adams discloses a content modification file for each device containing information for determining how the transformation of the document is performed in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Adams discloses receiving information from the device identifying the type of device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The device requests its corresponding content modification file, thus identifying itself to the server.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Adams discloses altering the document at a proxy server in fig. 2 and col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Adams discloses altering the document at an origin server in fig. 2 and col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Adams discloses a device that is not configured to display the entire document at one time in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Adams discloses a device comprising a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, or a telephone in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Adams discloses altering comprising date compression in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Adams discloses altering comprising word abbreviation in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Adams discloses altering comprising reducing the size of an image included in the original document in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device. Adams discloses a motivation for reducing the image in col. 2 lines 26-46.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Adams discloses reducing includes image compression, resampling, or conversion from color to black-and-white in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device. Adams discloses a motivation for reducing the image in col. 2 lines 26-46.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Adams discloses that the digital document is a web page in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding independent claim 26, Adams discloses maintaining a database that defines preferences associated with different client devices with respect to preferred alterations to be performed on full web pages requested by client devices that are not configured to display full web pages, the alterations making the documents more suitable for display on the client devices in fig. 1-2, col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11, and col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding independent claim 27, Adams discloses obtaining from a client device information about preferences with respect to preferred alterations to be performed on full documents requested by a client device that is not configured to display the full documents and associating the preferences with the client device in a database in fig. 1-2, col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11, and col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding independent claim 28, Adams discloses creating content for web pages to be served to types of client devices that are not configured to display full web pages and storing information about transformations that are to be made to the full web pages to make them suitable for display on the client devices, the stored information associated each of the types of

Art Unit: 2176

devices with transformations to be made to the full web pages requested by the type of device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (hereafter referred to as Adams), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999.**

Regarding dependent claim 12, Adams teaches storing preferences for a particular device in a content modification file in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Adams so that the content modification file was located locally on the device itself so that the transmission of the content modification file would not have been necessary, thus allowing a faster transmission of the requested document to the device.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Adams teaches storing preferences for a particular device in a content modification file in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The content modification file is a collection of metadata which includes information to determine how the document is transformed for the requesting device. A cookie is metadata contained locally on a browser to determine how a web page is to be displayed on the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified

Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to have put the content modification file data into a cookie and stored it locally on the requesting device so that the content modification information would have taken advantage of the cookie feature of the browser software installed on the requesting device. This would have reduced the transmission of data required for the requesting device to receive.

7. Claims 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (hereafter referred to as Adams), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999 in view of Halahmi, US 6,684,088 B1 filed 3/1/2000.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Adams does not teach segmenting a digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the segments in response to a request. Halahmi does teach segmenting a digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the segments in response to a request in fig. 5-6, col. 4 lines 49-67, and col. 10 line 57 – col. 15 line 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi into Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the document segmenting of Halahmi to have further reduced the amount of data transmitted to the requesting device of Adams.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Adams does not teach that the digital document comprises and email. Halahmi does teach that the digital document comprises and email in fig. 1-2, the abstract, and col. 2 line 60 – col. 3 line 39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi into

Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Adams so that it could have received email since small, low power, and low bandwidth devices such as the requesting devices are commonly used by people to access email accounts.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yu et al., US 6,684,087 B1 filed 5/7/1999 discloses transforming an image into a reduced version and dividing the reduced version into a number of subareas. The subareas are sent to the client device as requested by the user. Hind et al., US 6,715,129 B1 filed 10/13/1999 discloses transcoding the content of a document requested by a client, in order to tailor the output document according to application-specific characteristics. Kikinis, US 6,553,410 B2 filed 5/4/1998 discloses tailoring data and transmission protocol for efficient interactive data transactions over wide-area networks. A proxy server uses prestored characteristics of client devices to translate data from Internet sources into a reduced-content form adapted specifically to the client device. Kikinis, US 6,076,109 filed 1/30/1997 discloses transposing data files to alternative, low-information-density form for display by portable and other low-end computers. Hild et al., US 6,763,460 B1 filed 7/13/1999 discloses transmitting information data from a sender to a receiver via a transcoder. Greer et al., US 6,247,048 B1 filed 4/30/1998 discloses transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and thin client devices. Rossmann et al., US 6,119,155 filed 2/19/1998 discloses accelerating navigation of hypertext pages using compound requests. Gao, US 6,581,094 B1 filed 11/2/1999 discloses identifying a digital device based on the device's uniform device description file that specifies attributes of the device in an XML

Art Unit: 2176


document in a networked environment. Mighdoll et al., US 6,311,197 B2 continuation filed 6/3/1996 discloses a proxy server which separates a requested web page into partitions.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
July 20, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER